



**AGENDA NO: B-1**

**MEETING DATE: November 19, 2024**

**AGENDA CORRESPONDENCE  
RECEIVED BY THE PLANNING  
COMMISSION FOR PUBLIC REVIEW  
PRIOR TO THE MEETING**

## Angie Buoncristiano

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 18, 2024 6:10 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Fw:

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION:** This is an external email. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

Begin forwarded message:

On Monday, November 18, 2024, 5:35 PM, MAILER-DAEMON@aol.com <MAILER-DAEMON@aol.com> wrote:

Sorry, we were unable to deliver your message to the following address.

<[planningcomission@morrobayca.gov](mailto:planningcomission@morrobayca.gov)>:

550: 5.4.1 Recipient address rejected: Access denied.

[CH3PEPF0000000A.namprd04.prod.outlook.com 2024-11-19T01:35:01.600Z  
08DD010936CBC122]

----- Forwarded message -----

I agree with Betty's remarks about the new proposed development on the waterfront. I would add that it should not exceed the height limits and there should be no rooftop deck since no one uses them and do we really need another restaurant at that end? I feel like a "wall" is being built and the views are being ruined. Also eight units (for the hotel) vs the numerous units it will block, at 365 Embarcadero, is just dumb. Patti Anderson

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

## Angie Buoncristiano

---

**From:** Michelle Howard-Leicester [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 19, 2024 1:46 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**Subject:** 12/19/24 Waterfront Design

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION:** This is an external email. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Dear Planning Commission,

I would like the City, the Planning Commission, and the City Council to rethink the economics of this proposal as designed. One of the criteria of the RFP was to "maximize revenues." However, in the same line it also states, "Best and highest use of both the land and water portions of the site." Just as a reminder, the RFP was only for the cottages, not the shop and wharf.

I don't think these 2 quotes have to be in conflict, but should mesh together. How about if we change the order like this: "**Within the best and highest use of both the land and water portions of the site (including the shop and wharf), maximize revenues.**" So the question becomes: what is the best and highest use?

**I believe the best and highest use would do no harm** to the business across the street, reducing their TOT to the City but allowing them to continue to maximize their revenue to the City. *Keep it one story.*

**I believe the best and highest use would honor** the unanimous response from residents who have given you feedback saying, "We don't want another viewing deck, observation deck, or elevated walkway that blocks views and the general public won't use. *There is no need for public benefits because the height is no higher than 17 feet.*

**I believe the best and highest use would be to not replace a working marine business** with a food and wine tasting establishment, but to find a leaseholder who would continue in the established, necessary, and desirable business of marine construction. You won't find another Reggie Whibley who fished, dived, sailed, crafted, and could fix anything water-related; but you should holdout for someone who will do wharfs, revetment, etc. (You can't have a repair business without a shop and the shop is going away.) *If necessary separate 451 and 471 from 495.*

The 2-story at 495 doesn't need to be altered and no new lighting at the other *site saves on investment money.* Five hotel rooms, 1 new floating dock, 3 new finger slips, and 1 finger dock space with a low floating dock for a kayak rental business will *bring in revenue.* There may be space for off-street and EV parking, *bringing in revenue and saving on paying no in-lieu parking fees.* If the leaseholder is concerned about not spending enough to get the most years on his lease, that needs to change. *Best and highest use should be the determiner, what fits our harbor character, and the Commission should write a letter to the City Council to that effect.*

Sincerely,

**Michelle Leicester-Cadaret**

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone